

REMARKS

This Amendment is submitted in reply to the Final Office Action dated January 18, 2006. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and further examination of the patent application under 37 C.F.R. § 1.115.

Summary of the Examiner's Rejections

Claim 8 was objected to because the word "layer" was misspelled as "later".

Claims 1-2 and 6-7 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Barger (EP Patent Application 0311425 A2).

Claims 8-10 and 25 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Barger (EP Patent Application 0311425 A2) in view of Tozuka (US 6,139,967).

Claims 17-21 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Farrell (US 2,556,529) in view of Barger (EP Patent Application 0311425 A2).

Claims 22-24 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Barger (EP Patent Application 0311425 A2).

Summary of Amendment

Applicants have canceled Claims 8-10, 18-19 and 23-25 (without prejudice) and amended Claims 1-2, 6-7, 17 and 22 to more particularly define the present invention.

Remarks regarding objected Claim 8

Claim 8 was objected to because the word "layer" was misspelled as "later". Applicants have canceled Claim 8. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request removal of this objection.

Remarks regarding § 103(a) rejections

Applicants respectfully submit that amended independent Claims 1, 17 and 22 are not taught by Barger, Tozuka and/or Farrell. The claimed invention as recited in independent Claims 1, 17 and 22 follow:

1. A glass sheet comprising:
a top surface coated with a removable top protective film; and
a bottom surface coated with a removable bottom protective film, wherein at least one of the top protective film and bottom protective film has regular patterned embossed features formed therein (emphasis on main distinguishing limitation).

17. A container for holding a plurality of glass sheets, said container comprising:
a first side;
an opposing second side;
two additional sides;
a top; and
a bottom all of which enclose said glass sheets, each glass sheet includes:
a top surface coated with a removable top protective film; and
a bottom surface coated with a removable bottom protective film, wherein the
glass sheets are stacked next to one another such that the top protective film of one glass sheet is
adjacent to the bottom protective film of another glass sheet, wherein the top protective film and
bottom protective film on each glass sheet have regular patterned embossed features therein,
wherein the regular patterned embossed features on the top protective film have a different shape
or are located in a different position than the regular patterned embossed features on the bottom
protective film which make it easier to separate one glass sheet from another glass sheet because
of the presence of air pockets caused by the regular patterned embossed features located between
said stacked glass sheets (emphasis on main distinguishing limitation).

22. A material comprising:
a top surface coated with a removable top protective film; and
a bottom surface coated with a removable bottom protective film, wherein the top
protective film and bottom protective film have regular patterned embossed features therein,
wherein the regular patterned embossed features on the top protective film have a different shape
or are located in a different position than the regular patterned embossed features on the bottom
protective film which make it easier to separate said material that is stacked on another piece of
material because of the presence of air pockets caused by the regular patterned embossed features
located between said stacked materials (emphasis on main distinguishing limitation).

The teachings of Barger differ significantly from the present invention as recited in amended independent Claims 1, 17 and 22. Claims 1, 17 and 22 now recite a protective film that has regular patterned embossed features formed therein (support for this amendment can be found in FIGURES 1B, 2B, 2C, 3B and 3C). Barger does not disclose this limitation. Instead, Barger discloses where a rigid but pliable, smooth surface is covered with a one-sided random matte embossed polyethylene film. In particular, Barger states the following in col. 4, lines 23-28:

"Microscopically, the film has a random matte rather than a pattern matte. This means the matte embossed surface has high points or peaks with an irregular pattern which prevent the film from blocking on the roll because there is less intimate contact between the film layers. (emphasis added)"

Again, the amended independent Claims 1, 17 and 22 recite a protective film that has regular patterned embossed features formed therein. And, Barger discloses a one-sided random matte embossed polyethylene film. These are not the same configurations. In fact, Barger teaches away from the present invention since Barger wants a film that has a random matte with an embossed surface which has an irregular pattern (as


opposed to a regular pattern) to prevent the film from blocking on the roll because there is less intimate contact between the film layers. In contrast, the amended independent Claims 17 and 22 and dependent Claim 7 recite where a material (glass sheet) has a top surface and a bottom surface which are coated with protective films that have regular patterned embossed features formed therein. These claims also recite where the regular patterned embossed features on the top protective film have a different shape or are located in a different position than the regular patterned embossed features on the bottom protective film. Because of these limitations, one is ensured that air pockets will be present between properly stacked materials (glass sheets) and with the presence of air pockets this makes it easier to separate the stacked materials (glass sheets) (e.g., see FIGURES 2D and 3D). Tozuka and/or Farrell do not cure these defects. Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit that the aforementioned differences between Barger, Tozuka and/or Farrell and the present invention are indicative of the patentability of the amended independent Claims 1, 17 and 22 and their associated dependent claims 2, 6-7 and 20-21.

Conclusion

Applicants respectfully submit that all of the stated grounds of objections and rejections have been accommodated and rendered moot. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request the reconsideration of all outstanding objections and rejections and the allowance of pending Claims 1-2, 6-7, 17 and 20-22.

It is believed that a fee is not required for this paper. If this is incorrect, the Commissioner is authorized to charge any fees which may be required for this paper to Deposit Account No. 50-1481.

Respectfully submitted,



William J. Tucker
Reg. No. 41,356
(903) 489-2198

Corning Incorporated
Attn: Thomas R. Beall, Esq.
SP-TI-03-1
Corning, NY 14831